

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 260 057

SP 026 382

AUTHOR Adams, Ronald D.; Craig, James R.
TITLE A Survey of Undergraduate Teacher Education
Evaluation Practices.
PUB DATE 18 Feb 81
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Association of Colleges for Teacher
Education (Detroit, MI, February 18, 1981). For
related document, see SP 026 378.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference
Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Evaluation
Needs; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher
Education; *Program Evaluation; Self Evaluation
(Groups); *Teacher Education Programs

ABSTRACT

A preliminary investigation of teacher education evaluation practices was conducted to provide a basis for understanding the present state-of-the-practice in teacher education evaluation and to suggest directions to be taken to improve the practice. An analysis is presented of data obtained from 397 responding institutions. Findings are presented in eight categories: (1) institution demographics; (2) institutions engaged in teacher education evaluation; (3) area of data collected; (4) methods of data collection; (5) relationship between size of program and method of data collection; (6) perceived value of teacher education evaluation; (7) perceived needs in conducting teacher education evaluation; and (8) reported budget for evaluation. In a summary of findings, a list of 10 conclusions drawn from the preliminary analysis is provided. (JD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED260057

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Survey of Undergraduate
Teacher Education Evaluation Practices

by

Dr. Ronald D. Adams and

Dr. James R. Craig

Western Kentucky University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Adams

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

Presented to the Annual Meeting of the
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

February 18, 1981

Detroit, Michigan

The cost of printing this publication by Western Kentucky
University was paid from state funds KRS 57.375.

SP 026 382

I. INTRODUCTION

Several factors have led to our conduct of a survey of teacher education evaluation practice. First, due to our experience in teacher education evaluation since the Fall of 1971, we have had the opportunity for dialogue with numerous individuals who are planning or engaged in evaluation programs. Many of these individuals have expressed a desire to know the state-of-the-practice in teacher education evaluation.

Second, the growth of the TEPFU (Teacher Education Program Follow-Up) group and the high attendance at national meetings where teacher education evaluation topics were presented has demonstrated a continuing interest in this topic. One of the recommendations from the TEPFU group was that a study be conducted to determine the current evaluation practice in teacher education evaluation as there appears to be little research in the professional literature on this topic.

Third, the NCATE standards for accreditation have explicitly stated that institutions producing teachers must have a systematic evaluation of their teacher education programs to include gathering data while students are in the preservice program and after they have entered the teaching profession. Evidence must also be provided of utilization of data for program improvement. Undoubtedly, these standards have provided much of the interest in teacher education evaluation.

Finally, in a 1978 doctoral dissertation at the University of Tulsa, Wennette Pegues reported a survey of teacher education follow-up evaluation practice. This study provided a beginning for determining

the status of teacher education evaluation practice. Two of her findings have particular interest to this study. First, she concluded that, "There is only moderate contemporary involvement in systematic follow-up evaluative practices by teacher education programs." Only half of the respondents reported they were engaged in this practice. Second, she concluded that, "There is a minimal level of evaluative sophistication in the design and the implementation of contemporary evaluative schema." The most prevalent schema was the controversial one-shot questionnaire sent to graduates the first year following graduation.

From the preceeding discussion, it seemed clear that a current survey of teacher education evaluation practice could provide meaningful information in identifying needs and future directions in this area. An initial survey form was developed by the authors to obtain information from the following areas:

- 1) Institutional demographics
- 2) Topics on areas evaluated
- 3) Techniques used in evaluation system
- 4) Sources of evaluation data
- 5) Points of evaluation
- 6) Needs relative to evaluation practice
- 7) Value placed on evaluation
- 8) Resources devoted to evaluation

The initial survey form was reviewed by college administrators at WKU and a later revised version was sent to selected members of the TEPFU group, via assistance from the R&D Center for Teacher Education. Finally, the third version was sent to AACTE and NCATE officials for input.

All suggestions were considered, final changes were made, and the survey forms were mailed about the middle of November, 1980. Even with a short return time, the holiday season, and the rather lengthy form, a 36 percent return rate was obtained by the end of December. A follow-up survey was sent about the second week in January, 1981, resulting in an additional 20 percent return for a total of 442 returned survey forms to date.

To prepare for this program, data obtained from 397 forms (51 percent) were processed. The remaining will be reanalyzed for a later publication. This more complete report will contain detailed analyses and findings and should be available during the summer of 1981.

Time constraints do not permit presenting in great detail the results of this survey--in fact, much of the data have yet to be analyzed beyond the rudimentary findings prepared for this meeting. However, the findings presented here should provide a basis for understanding more fully the present state-of-the-practice in teacher education evaluation, and suggest directions we must take as a profession if we are to improve this essential practice.

II. FINDINGS

The findings presented for this program represent a preliminary analyses of the data obtained from 397 responding institutions. Thirty-eight additional questionnaires have been received since these analyses were conducted and are being prepared for inclusion in the data set. Nine institutions did not qualify for inclusion for analysis due to such factors as having no undergraduate programs or are no longer in operation. The accounted for responses totaled 444 for a return rate of 57.0 percent.

The findings will be presented in eight categories:

- A. Institution Demographics
- B. Institutions Engaged in Teacher Education Evaluation
- C. Area of Data Collected
- D. Methods of Data Collection
- E. Relationship Between Size of Program and Method of Data Collection
- F. Perceived Value of Teacher Education Evaluation
- G. Perceived Needs in Conducting Teacher Education Evaluation
- H. Reported Budget for Evaluation

Undoubtedly, additional analyses will provide more information regarding the state-of-the-practice in teacher education evaluation than these preliminary analyses. However, we feel findings from these analyses provide more insight into what is being done in teacher education evaluation than has been known to date.*

A. Institution Demographics

The responding institutions were evenly split between public and private with 52.4 percent public and 46.3 percent private. NCATE

* Due to space limitations the tabular presentation of data will be limited in this report.

accredited institutions comprised 63.7 percent of the sample while 82.6 percent reported membership in AACTE. Geographic region represented by responding institutions was indicated by membership in regional accrediting agencies and can be seen in Table 1. Institutions in the North Central Association comprised 48.4 percent of the respondents, followed by the Southern Association with 27.4 percent and the Middle States Association with 11.5 percent. These data are very close to the percentages obtained by Pegues in 1978.

Institutional size ranged from 300 to 63,115, with undergraduate teacher education programs ranging from 13 to 7,300. These data are presented in Table 2. It can be observed that 57.7 percent of the programs have 500 or less enrollment.

Institutions producing only Bachelors Degrees made up 31.8 percent of the sample while 22.0 percent of the responding institutions offer the Doctorate.

B. Institutions Engaged in Teacher Education Evaluation

Two categories of data, size of undergraduate teacher education program and public/private classification were cross tabulated with institutions' response to Question 1, Part II of the survey form. This question asked institutions to indicate if they were engaged in evaluation of their undergraduate teacher education programs. From the responses it was determined that 88.7 percent of the institutions indicated some evaluation activity.

A cross tabulation of size of program and public or private classification indicated a relatively strong relationship between these two variables. Smaller programs tend to be in private institutions while larger programs tend to be in public institutions. While this

TABLE 1
Summary of Institutions by Selected Demographic Categories

Category	f	%
Public	208	52.4
Private	184	46.3
NCATE accredited	253	63.7
AACTE member	328	82.6
Regional Accrediting Assoc.		
New England	17	4.4
Middle States	45	11.5
North Central	192	48.4
Northwest	20	5.1
Southern	107	27.4
Western	9	2.3

TABLE 2
Summary of Institutions Responding by Size of Enrollment

Enrollment	300 to 1,300	1,400 to 3,600	3,779 to 6,500	6,808 to 10,000	10,026 to 20,000	20,142 to 63,115
Total Inst.						
%	25.6	24.4	16.6	11.1	15.0	7.3
Cum %	25.6	50.0	66.6	77.7	92.7	100.0
Under Grad. Teacher Ed. Program	13 to 100	104 to 250	255 to 500	525 to 1,000	1,100 to 2,000	2,072 to 7,300
%	14.0	21.1	22.6	19.7	15.8	6.8
Cum %	14.0	35.1	57.7	77.4	93.2	100.0

Valid cases = 385

relationship is not surprising, it should be kept in mind when discussing other analyses.

Three categories of size were utilized in the cross tabulation analysis with those reporting evaluation practices. They were as follows:

small - 1 to 250

medium - 251 to 1,000

large - 1,001 to 7,500

There appeared to be little difference in the percentage of institutions reporting evaluation practice and the size of the teacher education program.

Similarly, when public or private classification was cross tabulated with reported evaluation practice no meaningful differences were noted. This was expected due to the relationship between program size and public/private classification.

C. Area of Data Collection

Institutions were asked to respond to a list of seven evaluation areas for which they collected data. They were instructed to check each area for which they collected data. The "Teaching Skills, Strategies, and Techniques" received the most checks, with "Knowledge of Subject Matter" and "Relationships with Students" following, respectively. The least checked items were "Relationship with Parents" and "Participation in Professional Organizations", respectively.

Additional analyses are planned to determine if there are relationships between evaluation areas and other variables. For example, the question, "are method and area related?", may provide some insight into source of data collection and what is being collected.

D. Methods of Data Collection

The major focus of the survey was to determine the state-of-the-practice in teacher education evaluation. A major component was the methods employed to collect data to include type of data collecting devices or procedures, source of data and frequency or points of data collection. Institutions were asked to respond to seven data collection procedures each having a matrix of data source by collection frequency. Through this reporting procedure it could be determined the most often utilized source and the frequency data were collected from sources for any given procedure.

The seven data collection procedures contained in the survey were:

1. Questionnaires
2. Personal Interviews
3. Direct Classroom Observation
4. Media-Aided Work Sample Observation
5. Standardized Tests
6. Professional Competence Measures
7. Personal Characteristics and Attitudes Measures

Respondents were asked to place the approximate percent of program enrollment sampled for each data collection period and each source. While the majority of respondents followed these directions, several returned surveys had only checks in the matrix grids. Thus, for these preliminary analyses, sample size was not considered; rather, the frequency of participation only was established.

Data from these questions provided "maps" of evaluation practice that describes the methods utilized in teacher education evaluation.

While these analyses provided only summary data on methods of evaluation, they allow for some generalizations to be drawn.

Questionnaires were by far the most utilized form of collecting evaluation data, both in preservice and follow-up. The source most often given was the student/graduate and the most frequent point of data collection was at exit from program (65.8 percent). The supervisor was the second most used source for evaluation data with peers providing some data in the preservice program. Table 3 presents these data.

When a usage criteria of 10 percent was utilized to examine the results, it was determined that data were collected from student/graduate and supervisor at entry and continued through the 4-6 year of follow-up. Peer data were only used in the preservice program in categories "during" and "exit". The heavy black line indicates the cells which met the usage criteria.

Personal interviews were used to a much lesser extent than questionnaires, and were limited primarily to use in the preservice program. The student/graduate and supervisor were again the primary sources. Table 4 contains the summary data on personal interviews.

Use of direct classroom observation as a technique for collecting evaluation data was quite limited except in preservice programs. Students/graduates were observed in many programs during and at the end of teacher education programs, and to a very limited extent during the first year of teaching. Pupils were observed mostly during the undergraduate preparation program. These data are presented in Table 5.

The method using media-aided work sample observations produced a 10 percent usage in only the "during" category of the preservice program. Table 6 shows these data.

TABLE 3

Summary Analysis of Institutions Utilizing
Questionnaires in Evaluation of Teacher Education Programs

		Questionnaires								
		Preservice Program			Follow Up Year					
Data Source		Entry	During	Exit	1	2	3	4-6	7-10	11+
The student/graduate	f	119	169	223	180	71	96	96	12	5
	%	35.1	49.9	65.8	53.1	20.9	28.3	28.3	3.5	1.5
A Supervisor (advisor, principal, dept. supervisor, etc.)	f	37	145	153	151	51	71	66	7	4
	%	16.8	42.8	45.1	44.5	15	20.9	19.5	2.1	1.2
Peer Teachers	f	10	53	38	11	3	7	7	0	0
	%	2.9	15.6	11.2	3.2	.9	2.1	2.1	0	0
Pupils	f	4	26	13	8	4	6	5	0	1
	%	1.2	7.7	3.8	2.4	1.2	1.8	1.5	0	.3
Parents	f	2	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	.6	1.5	.9	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	f	7	9	12	7	1	2	0	0	0
	%	2.1	2.7	3.5	2.1	.3	.6	0	0	0

TABLE 4

Summary Analysis of Institutions Utilizing
Personal Interviews in Evaluation of Teacher Education Programs

		Personal Interviews								
		Preservice Program			Follow Up Year					
Data Source		Entry	During	Exit	1	2	3	4-6	7-10	11+
The student/graduate	f	88	105	87	32	10	9	17	2	3
	%	26	31	25.7	9.4	2.9	2.7	5.0	.6	.9
A Supervisor (advisor, principal, dept. supervisor, etc.)	f	37	91	84	35	12	12	16	2	3
	%	10.9	26.8	24.8	10.3	3.5	3.5	4.7	.6	.9
Peer Teachers	f	6	35	26	6	1	2	1	1	0
	%	1.7	10.3	7.7	1.7	.3	.6	.3	.3	0
Pupils	f	3	10	5	2	2	1	0	0	0
	%	.9	2.9	1.5	.6	.6	.3	0	0	0
Parents	f	1	3	3	2	2	1	0	0	0
	%	.3	.9	.9	.6	.6	.3	0	0	0
Other	f	2	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	0
	%	.6	1.7	.9	.3	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE 5

Summary Analysis of Institutions Utilizing
Direct Classroom Observations in Evaluation
of Teacher Education Programs

Direct Classroom Observations

Data Source	Preservice Program			Follow Up Year					
	Entry	During	Exit	1	2	3	4-6	7-10	11+
The student/ graduate	f 55	f 225	f 139	f 34	f 12	f 11	f 11	f 3	f 2
	% 16.2	% 66.4	% 41.0	% 10.0	% 3.5	% 3.2	% 3.2	% .9	% .6
Pupils	f 9	f 42	f 29	f 12	f 6	f 5	f 4	f 1	f 1
	% 2.7	% 12.4	% 8.6	% 3.5	% 1.8	% 1.5	% 1.2	% .3	% .3
Other	f 7	f 28	f 19	f 5	f 1	f 0	f 2	f 0	f 0
	% 2.1	% 8.3	% 5.6	% 1.5	% .3	% 0	% .6	% 0	% 0

TABLE 6

Summary Analysis of Institutions Utilizing
Media-Aided Work Sample Observations in Evaluation
of Teacher Education Programs

Media-Aided Work Sample Observations

Data Source	Preservice Program			Follow Up Year					
	Entry	During	Exit	1	2	3	4-6	7-10	11+
The student/ graduate	f 16	f 158	f 33	f 5	f 1	f 3	f 0	f 0	f 1
	% 4.7	% 46.6	% 9.7	% 1.5	% .3	% .9	% 0	% 0	% .3
Pupils	f 3	f 22	f 9	f 2	f 0	f 1	f 0	f 0	f 0
	% .9	% 6.5	% 2.7	% .6	% 0	% .3	% 0	% 0	% 0
Other	f 0	f 8	f 1	f 0	f 0	f 0	f 0	f 0	f 0
	% 0	% 2.4	% .3	% 0	% 0	% 0	% 0	% 0	% 0

Use of standardized tests were also quite limited and were restricted to use in the preservice program. This type of data was primarily collected at entry and at exit to the undergraduate teacher education program as can be seen in Table 7.

The last two categories of data collection provided quite similar results. Professional competence and personal characteristics and attitudes were probably recorded as extensions of questionnaires by many respondents. They reflect usage during the preservice and first year follow-up with limited usage the third and fourth - sixth years of follow-up. Primary sources were the student/graduate and supervisor. Limited usage of peers as a source was noted during preservice. Tables 8 and 9 contain the summary data for these variables.

In summary, all techniques were used to varying degrees in preservice evaluations. The sources, however, were limited to the student/graduate, supervisor, and to a lesser degree peers. Follow-up evaluation was conducted less often than preservice evaluation. Also, fewer techniques were widely used for follow-up evaluation with questionnaires being by far the most often reported technique. As with preservice, the sources were mainly limited to student/graduate and supervisor.

E. Relationship Between Size of Program and Method of Data Collection

Given the extreme range in size of teacher education programs reported, the authors decided to investigate the relationship between size of program and methods of evaluation reported. Chi square analyses were utilized to determine if a relationship existed between the two sets of variables.

First, cross tabulations were made between size (broken into three categories) and overall indication of use for a given method or technique.

TABLE 7

Summary Analysis of Institutions Utilizing
Standardized Tests in Evaluation of Teacher Education Programs

Standardized Tests

Data Source	Preservice Program			Follow Up Year					
	Entry	During	Exit	1	2	3	4-6	7-10	11+
The student/graduate	f 46 % 13.6	f 28 % 8.3	f 99 % 29.2	f 8 % 2.4	f 5 % 1.5	f 6 % 1.8	f 3 % .9	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0
Pupils	f 0 % 0	f 2 % .6	f 3 % .9	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0
Other	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0	f 3 % .9	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0

TABLE 8

Summary Analysis of Institutions Utilizing
Professional Competence in Evaluation of Teacher Education Programs

Professional Competence

Data Source	Preservice Program			Follow Up Year					
	Entry	During	Exit	1	2	3	4-6	7-10	11+
The student/graduate	f 47 % 13.9	f 138 % 40.7	f 154 % 45.5	f 95 % 28.0	f 30 % 8.8	f 43 % 12.7	f 39 % 11.5	f 3 % .9	f 2 % .6
A Supervisor (advisor, principal, dept. supervisor, etc.)	f 38 % 11.2	f 151 % 44.5	f 147 % 43.4	f 107 % 31.6	f 29 % 8.6	f 45 % 13.3	f 43 % 12.7	f 3 % .9	f 1 % .3
Peer Teachers	f 12 % 3.5	f 42 % 12.4	f 34 % 10.0	f 13 % 3.8	f 2 % .6	f 10 % 2.9	f 4 % 1.2	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0
Pupils	f 5 % 1.5	f 15 % 4.4	f 15 % 4.4	f 10 % 2.9	f 4 % 1.2	f 8 % 2.4	f 5 % 1.5	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0
Parents	f 2 % .6	f 4 % 1.2	f 2 % .6	f 1 % .3	f 1 % .3	f 1 % .3	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0
Other	f 2 % .6	f 9 % 2.7	f 9 % 2.7	f 2 % .6	f 0 % 0	f 1 % .3	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0

TABLE 9

Summary Analysis of Institutions Utilizing
Personal Characteristics and Attitudes in Evaluation
of Teacher Education Programs

Personal Characteristics

Data Source	Preservice Program			Follow Up Year					
	Entry	During	Exit	1	2	3	4-6	7-10	11+
The student/graduate	f 71 % 20.9	f 126 % 37.2	f 129 % 38.1	f 65 % 19.2	f 17 % 5.0	f 33 % 19.7	f 28 % 8.3	f 4 % 1.2	f 2 % .6
A Supervisor (advisor, principal, dept. supervisor, etc.)	f 53 % 15.6	f 127 % 37.5	f 115 % 33.9	f 75 % 22.1	f 17 % 5.0	f 34 % 10.0	f 33 % 9.7	f 3 % .9	f 1 % .3
Peer Teachers	f 13 % 3.8	f 41 % 12.1	f 30 % 8.8	f 9 % 2.7	f 2 % .6	f 4 % 1.2	f 1 % .3	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0
Pupils	f 3 % .9	f 9 % 2.7	f 12 % 3.5	f 8 % 2.4	f 3 % .9	f 6 % 1.8	f 4 % 1.2	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0
Parents	f 2 % .6	f 4 % 1.2	f 2 % .6	f 1 % .3	f 1 % .3	f 1 % .3	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0
Other	f 7 % 2.1	f 11 % 3.2	f 6 % 1.8	f 2 % .6	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0	f 0 % 0

Chi squares were computed for each of the seven techniques and size. Only two of these analyses approached significance at the .05 level of confidence. It was observed that direct classroom observation and media-aided work sample observations obtained a large enough chi square value to approach or exceed the significance level of .05 when compared to program size. It would appear that in both cases, the smaller programs reported more use of these techniques than the larger programs.

A second set analyses dealt only with follow-up data. Due to the small frequency of use, only questionnaires, personal interviews, and direct classroom observations were included in these analyses. However, the analysis covered the first, third and fourth-sixth years of follow-up for each technique.

From these analyses an interesting finding emerged. There appeared to be a pattern of usage for techniques and program size. Four of the five chi square analyses were significant beyond the .05 level of confidence for the first year follow-up data. There appeared to be more usage among the larger programs of questionnaire, personal interview, and direct classroom observation than among the smaller programs. This was an opposite indication as found for direct classroom observation and media-aided work sample observation for total evaluation usage.

It also appeared that by the third year and beyond, the usage of these techniques diminished to the point of no differences between programs of varying size, i.e., for each size of program classification, there was little being done for follow-up evaluation.

F. Perceived Value of Teacher Education Evaluation

AACTE institutional representatives or their designee were asked to complete the survey form. It was noted that for the most part

administrators completed the questionnaire. In the "other" category, the most often given titles of the respondents were director of student teaching or director of the research unit. Thus, the perceptions of the value of teacher education evaluation was primarily from an administrative viewpoint.

Perceptions of the value of teacher education evaluation was compared for those institutions who had evaluation and those who reported no evaluation activities. While no formal statistical analysis was computed to determine the significance of the difference, it appeared that the institutions having evaluation programs valued teacher education evaluation more than did the non-evaluation institutions. However, both groups tended to perceive evaluation as more positive than negative.

Additional analyses were conducted to determine if size of program was related to perceived value of evaluation. Chi square analysis was utilized with both the institutions reporting evaluation programs and those not reporting evaluation programs.

In both cases there appeared to be no relationship found for administrators' perception of value of evaluation and size of program. However, in both groups there was a significant chi square found for perceived value of evaluation of faculty and program size. Faculty in the smaller programs were rated as valuing evaluation more than faculty in the larger institutions for both groups. Students were also rated as valuing evaluation more for those institutions who reported evaluation programs. It should be kept in mind, however, that the raters for the most part were administrators.

G. Perceived Needs in Conducting Teacher Education Evaluation

Respondents were also asked for perceived needs in conducting evaluation of teacher education programs. Again, those responding as having evaluation programs and not having evaluation programs were informally compared. "Developing Instrumentation" was a frequently given need for both groups, rank 3rd for the evaluation group and 1st for the non-evaluation group.

Assistance with "Planning and Implementing a Feedback System" and "Utilizing Data for Program Improvement" appeared to be the greatest need for institutions having evaluation programs, while "Planning an Evaluation System" and "Identifying Instrumentation" ranked number two for institutions not having an evaluation system.

H. Reported Budget for Evaluation

To estimate the resources being allocated to teacher education evaluation, institutions were asked to give the approximate operating budget for evaluation of teacher education programs. The range in budget allocations was from \$15 to \$81,610. Slightly more than 50 percent of the institutions reported spending less than \$1,250 on evaluation. However, 18.5 percent reported spending over \$10,000. The mean and median for all institutions were \$6,280.20 and \$1,202.50, respectively.

Institutions were also asked to indicate the source of funding for their evaluation program. Of those responding, 9.4 percent or 32 institutions indicated some or total external funding from public sources. In addition, 1.2 percent or four institutions reported funding from private funds. Most of the institutions that reported funding source (n=239),

III. SUMMARY FINDINGS

The following conclusions were made from the preceding preliminary analysis:

1. There appeared to be little difference in the percentage of institutions reporting evaluation practice and the size of enrollment in the teacher education program or whether the institution was public or private.
2. The areas of "Teaching Skills, Strategies, and Techniques", "Knowledge of Subject Matter", and Relationships with Students" were the most frequently evaluated.
3. Questionnaires were by far the most used method of collecting data with the student/graduate the most frequent reported source of data.
4. More evaluation practice and more varied methods of evaluation were reported for preservice evaluation than for follow-up evaluation.
5. Smaller institutions tended to use Direct Classroom Observations and Media Aided Work Sample Observations more than larger institutions. However this technique was most often reported in preservice evaluation practice.
6. When only follow-up evaluation was considered, there were differences noted the first year, but not the third or fourth-sixth years for Questionnaires, Personal Interview, and Direct Classroom Observation. The larger institutions appeared to be engaged more often than the smaller institutions for the first year follow-up, but no differences emerged after the first year. There was a tendency for smaller institutions to do more follow-up at the fourth-sixth year point.
7. From the college administrator perspective, the following values were observed:
 - a. Institutions who responded that they have evaluation programs, valued evaluation practice more highly than institutions who reported no evaluation programs.
 - b. Size of program was not related to the degree administrators valued evaluation practice.
 - c. Faculty and students in smaller institutions were perceived to value evaluation practice higher than their counterparts in larger institutions.

indicated total internal funding for their evaluation programs (92.9 percent). Those not reporting funding source totaled 100. Of those institutions reporting funding sources, 23.3 percent indicated funding on a one year basis, while 71.1 percent indicated funding was recurrent.

8. Programs that reported evaluation practice most often perceived the following needs, respectively:
 - a. Planning and Implementing a Feedback System.
 - b. Utilizing Data for Program Improvement.
 - c. Developing Instrumentation.
9. Programs that did not report an evaluation program perceived the following needs most frequently:
 - a. Developing Instrumentation.
 - b. Identifying Instrumentation.
 - c. Planning an Evaluation System.
10. Programs reporting operating budgets varied greatly in the amounts of support. In nearly all cases funding was from internal funds and most reported recurring funding.